

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District Office

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Lead: Katrina Leavitt

Field Office: Sierra Front

Lead Office: Sierra Front

Case File/Project Number: N/A

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 1.6 Nondestructive data collection, inventory (including field, aerial, and satellite surveying and mapping), study, research, and monitoring activities.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-2011-C020-0503-CX

Project Name: NRCS Climate Stations

Project Description: The Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) has requested authorization to construct three climate stations at the south end of the Pine Nut range. The proposed locations are along the western boundary of the WSA. The proposal is to install the stations during the fall of 2011 and collect climate data until 2016. Installation of the stations would result in a total surface disturbance 3m^2 ($1\text{m}^2/\text{station}$). The moisture and temperature sensors need to be buried to a depth of 1m. Holes would be dug by hand at each proposed location, the sensors would be placed 1 m below the soil surface and the holes would be backfilled with soil. Please reference the attached diagram and picture of the climate stations. Data collected from these stations would support a soil climate study.

Applicant Name: Natural Resource Conservation Service

Project Location: T11N, R22E, Portions of Sections 9 & 10

BLM Acres for the Project Area: < 0.05 acres

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number):

Name of Plan: NV – Carson City RMP.

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria:

(Specialist
review:
initial in
appropriate box)

<i>If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.</i>	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (project lead/P&EC)		KG
2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? (wildlife biologist, hydrologist, outdoor recreation planner, archeologist)		NC AL PZ SC
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (project lead/P&EC)		KG
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (project lead/P&EC)		KG
5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? (project lead/P&EC)		KG
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (project lead/P&EC)		KG
7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office? (archeologist)		SC
8. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the list of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? (wildlife biologist, botanist)		PZ DT
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (project lead/P&EC)		KG
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? (project lead/P&EC)		KG
11. Would the Proposed Action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007)? (archeologist)		SC
12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)? (botanist)		DT

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW: During ID Team consideration of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

Ken Nelson, Realty Specialist

Arthur Callan, Outdoor Recreation Planner

Nicki Cutler, Hydrologist

Steve Christy, Archaeologist

Pilar Ziegler, Wildlife Biologist/BLM Sensitive Species - Wildlife

Dean Tonenna, Botanist - Natural Resource Specialist/BLM Sensitive Species - Plants

Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Although BLM Sensitive Species is not described in one of the 12 extraordinary circumstances question, review of the applicability of this CX has taken them into consideration.

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:



Linda J. Kelly
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

July 18, 2011
(date)